



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

EM  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/533,685	03/23/2000	Michael Lee Hearn	600.1040	9876

23280            7590            02/19/2003

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC  
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10018

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/533,685</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Hearn</b>
	Examiner <b>Clark F. Dexter</b>	Art Unit <b>3724</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. William Gehris

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 13, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic      b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes    e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Boston et al., pn 5,740,709

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Gehris called to discuss language to obviate the outstanding rejections. To obviate the rejection under 35 USC 112, Mr. Gehris proposed adding the subject matter of claim 4 into claim 1. Mr. Dexter stated that it appears that this would obviate the 112 rejection. Regarding the prior art rejection, Mr. Gehris proposed adding language defining the nip being downstream and upstream from the cutting elements of the first and second cutting and nipping devices. Mr. Dexter stated that, at least for the first cutting and nipping device, it appears that this language would define over Boston. Mr. Dexter noted that such amendments would likely raise new issues that require further consideration and/or search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CLARK F. DEXTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3724

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.